DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 920 CG 004 110

By-Drake, Raymond W. Jr.

Review of the Literature for Freshman Orientation Practices in the U.S.

American Coll. Personnel Association.; Colorado State Univ., Ft. Collins.
Pub Date 66
Note-39p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.05
Descriptors-*College Freshmen, College High School Cooperation, College Programs, *Educational Counseling, *Educational Philosophy, *Literature Reviews, *Orientation

Virtually the entire body of literature in the area of freshman orientation which has been published since 1923 is reviewed. The author sketches the historical background of the orientation concept; early practices, and more recent trends with current emphasis on the Freshman Week and the Pre-College Clinic are presented. While it is hoped that orientation programs will meet the needs of both the student and the school, they seem far more successful in meeting the needs of the institution than those of the student. Evolvement of an orientation philosophy is discussed, together with the pressures acting against successful programs in the area of intellectual orientation. The author feels that the ideal of orienting incoming students to collegiate intellectual life will not be easily achieved, but that further research is needed to determine whether, in fact, it can be effectively accomplished at all. (Author/CJ)

ED030920

ACPA COMMISSION II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE for

FRESHMAN ORIENTATION PRACTICES IN THE U.S.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

Raymond W. Drake, Jr.

Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado
1966

004110

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature herein reviewed covers virtually the entire period of time in which literature in freshman orientation has been published, 1923 to the present. Every reasonable effort has been made to exhaustively consider that literature in order to obtain and present a picture of orientation literature which is comprehensive both in scope and in detail.

Literature on freshman orientation is essentially of three types. First, there are numerous reports which list the presence and extent of use of various orientation activities and practices. The early literature, from the 1920's to the 1950's, is largely of this sort. Second, there are the studies which report upon the effectiveness of different orientation practices for achieving desired ends. In general, rigorous studies of this sort are rare in the literature, but a few have been reported since the late 1950's. And, third, there are the discussions and presentations of ideas. The philosophy of orientation is derived largely from this sort of literature. These reports are most prevalent in the 1960's.

In general, there has been little research conducted on freshman orientation. This is reflected in the dearth of research reports (beyond mere practices surveys) in the literature.

An Historical Sketch of Early Freshman Orientation Practices

Organized attempts to assist freshmen to adapt to the college and university environment are on record as early as 1888 when Boston University inaugurated an orientation course for its freshmen. Actually, however, freshman orientation efforts became more frequent about the turn of the century and were well on the way to becoming a permanent feature of the college scene by the 1920's. The material in this section has been gleaned and compiled from a variety of sources. The practices reported herein represent the

total of reported freshmen orientation efforts of the period 1900 to 1924 insofar as they are known to the author.

Originally the freshman course was the only means used to orient new students to college. In 1900 the Mechanical Engineering department of the University of Michigan required all freshmen to register for a series of lectures, which, in rudimentary form, included the basic elements of later freshman orientation programs. This course was required, but no academic credit was given. In 1911 Reed College offered freshmen a similar course for credit entitled "College Life." The University of Washington presented a comparable course later in the same year. Also in the fall of 1911, the University of Michigan began holding a series of weekly assemblies for freshmen dealing with various phases of university life. In 1916 Oberlin College introduced a required non-credit course to orient freshmen toward future careers.

Doermann (1926) described several freshman orientation courses which had their beginnings around 1920 and were currently in use. Dartmouth College began its orientation course, "Evolution," in 1919 and added to this a course entitled "Problems of Citizenship," in 1924. These courses were typical of orientation courses of the period which attempted to introduce freshmen to broad social, economic, philosophical, political, and scientific issues rather than to assist freshmen with personal adjustment to college. Columbia College's course, begun in 1924, was entitled, "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization." Other courses of the period such as those at Antioch College, Brown University, and the University of Minnesota attempted both to be broad introductions to pertinent issues and to assist freshmen with such problems as study techniques, the use of the library, personal etiquette, and

vocational choice.

Later, another means of introducing new students to institutions of higher learning appeared on the scene - "Freshman Week." "Freshman Week" was the name given to a period of testing, counseling, informing, registering, and entertaining prior to the opening of classes. This orientation period and process was first called "Freshman Week" at the University of Maine in 1923. The idea without the name pre-dates 1923, however, for Wellesley College records such a "week" from 1916 and claims to have employed the idea as early as 1914. Similarly, the University of Rochester in 1918 required all freshmen to report for one week before classes for an examination and instruction on the nature, aims, and methods of college study and college life.

The Freshman course and "Freshman Week" were the earliest procedures employed to assist freshmen with the transition from high school to college. Due to the rapid extension of special orientation procedures after 1925 it is impossible to further trace the growth of the orientation movement in detail. The following section, however, will attempt to outline various trends in the movement.

Trends in Freshman Orientation

The freshman orientation movement has experienced phenomenal growth in the past forty years. Since its beginnings orientation has never suffered a decline in extent of practice. Presently (Kronovet, 1966) more than 92 per cent of United States colleges and universities employ one or more forms of freshman orientation procedures.

This period of time has seen the Freshman week become the

most popular means of orienting the new student to college life. It has also seen the orientation course increase and then decline in usage. During the same period the course underwent considerable internal changes as well. And, in recent years a new orientation practice, the pre-college summer clinic, has come into existence on a number of campuses. The growth and character of each of these techniques will be considered in this section.

Freshman Week

Freshman Week is a period of from two to seven (usually four or five) days in length immediately preceding the beginning of fall term classes, that has traditionally been set aside for testing, counseling, registering for classes, attending lectures, touring the campus and library, and engaging in various social and recreational activities.

After its introduction at the University of Maine in 1923, Freshman Week spread rapidly to other United States campuses. For example, Stoddard and Freden (1926) surveyed the 100 largest colleges and universities in the United States to determine the extent of use of Freshman Week, and found that twenty-seven (32% of 84 respondents) of the institutions had already had a Freshman Week. Twenty-one others (26% of the respondents) had definitely set a date for its inauguration. Numbers of schools instituting Freshman Week were (by year): 1923-3; 1924-8; 1925-15; 1926-20 (definitely scheduled). Interestingly, three schools reported 1923 as the date of beginning Freshman Week although the University of Maine is usually cited as the school to have begun the practice in 1923. One school reported that it had begun the practice in 1922. They described the "week" as ranging from one to seven days

with a mean of 3.66 days. Lectures were cited as the most prominent means of conveying information to the freshmen. Jones (1927) studied 281 colleges and universities and found that 60 per cent of them had already instituted Freshman Week. This finding was consistent with the findings and projections of Stoddard and Freden's study.

The period of greatest proportional growth of Freshman Week was during these early years. The years 1925 to 1927 inclusive were the years of the most rapid expansion of Freshman Week (Jones, 1927; Knode, 1930). Apparently the practice spread most rapidly among large universities and only afterward to smaller schools (Miller, 1930).

Reports on prevalence of Freshman Week vary in the 1930's. Miller (1930) found that 64 per cent of his sample (N=50) engaged in the practice. Knode (1930) found that roughly half of the schools (N=47) he studied employed it. The 1938 Research Bulletin of the National Education Association reported that 83.1 per cent of 423 institutions were employing Freshman Week at that time.

It appears that with the 1940's the use of Freshman Week as the predominate means of orientation began a slow decline. But the practice is a long way from disappearing from the campus scene. Studies on the prevalence of Freshman Week are sparse for the last twenty years but a declining trend seems to be evident. For example, in 1948 Bookman reported that only 71.8 per cent of the 188 institutions she surveyed employed the "week" for orientation purposes. This was a drop of more than ten per cent from that reported in NEA Research Bulletin ten years before. In 1956 Ludeman found that it was in use by 78.4 per cent of the institu-

tions he surveyed (N=37). It is impossible to say whether this represents an actual increase in use over the eight years between his and Bookman's study or whether it is simply a result of sampling fluctuation. The latter possibility seems more likely in the light of Ludeman's small sample. In 1966 Kronovet reported that only 59 per cent of her sample (N=1,378) engaged in Freshman Week activities.

While Freshman Week has fluctuated in extent of use from its beginnings, its content has remained virtually unchanged until the present. The typical Freshman Week of the 1920's lasted three or four days and included informational assemblies, registration, teas, dances, picnics, tours, and freshman problems sessions. The typical present day Freshman Week can be described with almost the same list.

The Freshman Course

The freshman course originally had at least one of two goals: (1) to introduce the new student to broad areas of study and/or (2) to assist the new student with problems specific to his freshman status. The latter purpose has almost entirely replaced the former during the history of the orientation course.

The freshman course runs anywhere from one quarter to two semesters in length, may be offered with or without credit, and meets from one to three times a week. Typically a basic text (or texts) is used, and several instructors from various college departments are utilized in teaching the course. Recently the course has actually, in some instances, become a series of problem-centered small group discussions.

During the history of the orientation course there has been

a marked change in its content. In its earliest forms the course was designed to give new students an overview of the intellectual world and academic methods. For example, Ball (1923) stated that courses to convey to freshmen an overall view of the contemporary academic scene and to assist them in acquiring a judicial mind were very popular at the time.

In 1926 Doermann presented details on several extant freshman courses. He noted the presence on campuses of both the intellectual survey type of courses and the course which stressed freshmen problems. By 1930 well over half of the institutions offering freshman courses offered a freshman adjustment type of course (Knode, 1930; Miller, 1930). In 1948 Bookman reported that approximately one-third of 188 institutions offered a required "adjustment to college" type of orientation course. Only twelve, or 6.4 per cent, of the institutions offered the "adjustment to the social and intellectual world of today" type of course, which in every case was actually a series of required lectures.

During this same period of time the freshman course increased in popularity. Figures on the extent of the use of the freshman orientation course indicate that from one-third to one-half of the colleges and universities offered courses during the years 1930 to 1950 (Knode, 1930; Miller, 1930; Bookman, 1948).

During the 1950's the orientation course continued to be a popular means of orienting freshmen to college. In 1951 Ruth Strang (Wrenn, 1951) stated that the trend was in the direction of expecting less of Freshman Week programs and depending more upon a one semester course to orient freshmen. There is some evidence to support Strang's prediction, though the upswing in extent of

use of the course was apparently short-lived.

For example, Greene (1954) studied the status of the orientation course in colleges with student populations under 2,000 and reported that thirty-six out of sixty-nine respondents (52.1%) offered orientation courses. He reported further that, of the thirty-three schools which did not offer a course, more than one-third definitely planned to begin one. If those schools which expressed an intention to institute a course had actually done so, the extent of the course for this sample would have been about 60 per cent within one or two years of Greene's study. In 1956 Ludeman reported that 67.6 per cent of his small sample (N=37) of midwestern institutions extended all or some of their orientation services over several weeks of the first term. Ludeman did not label this extension a "course." He concluded, "The trend is toward distributing orientation over longer periods of time rather than concentrating it in a few days at the opening of the school year." Subsequent events were to show that Ludeman's conclusion was incorrect.

The last ten years have seen a sharp decline in the extent of use of the freshman course. Plutchik found that only 44 per cent of 247 institutions offered orientation programs of at least a semester's length in 1958. By 1966, Kronovet could report that only 14.6 per cent of 1,378 institutions offered orientation programs of at least a semester in length.

The freshman orientation course, during its nearly eighty years of existence, has changed both in content and in extent of use. It appears that it has become nearly obsolete.

Not all reports on the freshman course have been concerned

simply with its degree of prevalence on the college campus. Some recent reports have suggested new uses or potentials for the course. For example, Lee and Froe (1956) suggested that the course be used to instruct in study skills. Hoffman and Plutchik (1959) stated that the small group orientation class could profitably be used to foster better attitudes toward the tools of learning and academic work.

As early as 1954, Greer (Lloyd-Jones and Smith, 1954) recommended small group discussions as an excellent means of assisting freshmen to adjust to college. Quite recently two studies were conducted on the effectiveness of such small groups in assisting new students.

In 1963 Bernard Smith reported the results of his work with freshmen meeting regularly in small groups at the University of Kentucky. He tested and confirmed the hypothesis that regular, small group, problem-oriented discussions would significantly increase the number of freshmen to remain in college. Twenty-four per cent of the carefully matched control group failed to register for the second semester of the freshman year, whereas only 8 per cent of those who participated in the discussions failed to do so.

Reiter (1964) also worked with small groups which met for six months during the freshman year in the "Orientation Program" at Hoffstra College. He reported phenomenal results:

> Thus, the Orientation Program has tentatively demonstrated that such attitudes as those toward the importance of learning at college, the development of a "mature" philosophy of life while attending college, and a more favorable outlook on college life in general ... were modified more as a result of the Orientation Program than as a result of college attendance or maturation alone.

Such a conclusion has implications not only for orientation practices but also for the goals and effectiveness of a college education itself.

At its present stage of development, the freshman course, while not widely used, survives in two forms: (1) the regularly scheduled course and (2) the series of small-group discussions. With the decline of the regular freshman course and the publication of reports like Smith's and Reiter's, the future may see widespread use of the small-group discussions as an orientation practice.

The Pre-College Clinic

The typical pre-college clinic is held for two to four days during the summer and involves the incoming freshman in testing counseling, and some social and informational activities. Where the pre-college clinic is used, it is usually held several times during the summer months so that the groups involved are small. It is most popular with large universities.

No mention is made of pre-college clinics in the literature prior to 1953. Goodrich and Pierson (1959) reported that Michigan State University began the practice in 1949. And a unique summer clinic at Allegheny College was begun in 1946, although this was used to orient student to college-in-general rather than to Allegheny specifically (McCracken, Wharton and Graff, 1956).

Reports on the pre-college clinic generally indicate as its values that it: (1) is effective in improving grades and initial adjustment to college; (2) provides a good public relations tool; (3) reduces the fall testing load; (4) lessens confusion for freshmen in the fall; (5) helps personalize the large institution;

(6) involves the student earlier in college life and aims; (7) provides an opportunity for possible early detection and prevention of emotional problems; (8) provides for the development of a case folder on each student (Goodrich, 1953; Goodrich and Pierson, 1959; Wall and Ford,1966; Forrest and Knapp, 1966). Robertson (1959) reported that the pre-college program at the University of Mississippi was effective in changing students' self-evaluations and attitude toward college studies. McCracken, Whorton and Graff (1956) found that a five day clinic at Allegheny College seemed "... to increase an understanding of and motivation toward college studies."

The Pennsylvania State University pre-college clinic includes a counseling program for parents. Wall (1962) has suggested that counseling parents might be a means of facilitating the emergence of the student as an independent, self-disciplined, and self-motivated person. He later cited anecdotal evidence in support of his suggestions (Wall, 1965).

Reports on the pre-college clinic are generally favorable, but only a few are based upon research findings. The only dissenting voice seems to be that of Fahrback (1960) who has suggested that pre-college programs are essentially administrative conveniences though they may contribute to academic success in some instances.

It is difficult to ascertain from the literature the present extent of use of the pre-college clinic. Forrest and Knapp (1966) found that 57 per cent of the institutions they surveyed (N=137) either conducted summer programs or anticipated doing so in the near future. But Kronovet, also in 1966, found that fewer than one per cent of the institutions (N=1,378) she surveyed conducted

such programs. The present study will shed some light on this dilemma.

The pre-college clinic is a recent arrival on the college orientation scene. Reports on its effectiveness as an orientation device are decidedly favorable, and the implications of the research that has been conducted are far-reaching. It seems reasonable to expect that, as college enrollments continue to expand, this procedure will see much greater use (Forrest and Knapp, 1966).

The Freshman and Orientation

As Black (1963) has pointed out, knowledge of freshman needs is a necessary condition for an effective orientation program. Crookston (no date) has suggested that, while orientation programs were designed to meet both student and institutional needs, most programs had the greater emphasis upon meeting the needs of the institutions. It would seem advisable, then, to know what the characteristics of freshmen (needs, aspirations, fears, etc.) are and to design orientation programs with those characteristics in mind. It is the purpose of this section of the review of the literature to seek to answer the question "What are freshmen like?" The focus, then, is not upon what is being done in orientation but who it is that is being oriented.

Not a great deal of consideration has been given in the literature to determine the needs, aspirations, and other characteristics of freshmen. Most of what has been done has been done quite recently. It seems that in earlier years freshman characteristics were thought to be so obvious that it was assumed that everyone knew them. Inferring from the descriptions of early orientation

programs and goals (Knode, 1926; Lloyd-Jones, 1929; Voigt, 1938), it appears that the important needs of freshmen were essentially related to their immediate adjustment to the college setting.

In recent years, however, there has been an increasing number of reports concerned with characterizing the freshman. In 1955 Moser studied fears of entering freshmen and found the five highest ranking to be: (1) ability to do college work; (2) selection of the right major; (3) friendliness of college teachers; (4) ability to make friends; (5) securing a desirable roommate. Academic and personal-social needs, in that order, appear to rank high with freshmen (Lloyd-Jones, 1954).

It is Warnath's (1961) opinion that the new student's successful adaptation to college is dependent, not upon his intellectual capacities alone, but also upon his attitudes and values. He suggested that if the prevailing values of an institution, particularly the implicit educational values, did not concur with the entering student's, a conflict would ensue which could only be resolved by his leaving or adopting the new values.

Stern (Brown, 1961) compared freshmen with seniors at an unnamed institution using the College Characteristics Index and the Activities Index. He reported that freshmen expected to find less pressure toward personal independence than seniors indicated was characteristic of the institution; they expected to find more pressure toward extreme forms of emotional expression than seniors indicated was characteristic of the institution; and they anticipated an academic emphasis well above that which the seniors indicated was true of the institution. With regard to the last point he stated, "The students come expecting to learn; they learn

not to expect so much." Also with regard to the last point, McConnell (Brown, 1961) reported similar findings in comparing freshmen and seniors at four institutions.

Tautfest (1961) surveyed seventy-eight prospective Purdue University freshmen to determine their desires for the orientation program. The students wanted the program first, to inform them of academic responsiblities, second, to assist them with academic program planning and, third, to familiarize them with the campus. Other expressed desires for orientation were listed. At least the first two desires are exactly parallel to the fears Moser (1955) reported. Tautfest stated that, as a result of the survey, the orientation program was altered to meet the freshmen needs.

With regard to freshman characteristics, as with other aspects of the orientation problem, definitive research is sparse. But, in general, it appears that entering students primarily concerned with academic adjustment and, perhaps secondarily, with personal-social adjustment in college. Fitzgerald (1963) has stated the crux of this freshman characteristics - freshman orientation issue:

> A consensus of current educational literature indicates general agreement that students 'of the sixties' reflect a greater motivation toward academic endeavors. Are our orientation programs planned and staffed to meet the requirements of new students of this era?

Perhaps as further research on freshman needs and expectations is conducted and reported, orientation programs will be designed to meet those needs and expectations as well as the needs and expectations of the colleges and universities.

The Secondary School and The College

In essence the problem of orientation is the problem of the differences there are between the secondary and higher educational systems. Admittedly, articulation from secondary school to college is a problem, but why? The inadequacy of the educational training received in the public secondary school is often cited as a major problem in articulation (Bestor, 1953; McCracken, 1964). Patouillet (Lloyd-Jones and Smith, 1954) has stated that the core of the problem of articulation is the lack of common purposes shared by secondary and higher education. Also, Gow (1961) has cited the lack of cooperation and communication between personnel in the two educational spheres as the issue.

There appears to be, then, several aspects to the problem. The colleges and universities are dissatisfied with the quality of education and motivation of high school graduates. Colleges and high schools do not share common purposes; supposedly the former see learning as valuable per se and the latter take an instrumental view of learning. And, generally there has been little cooperation and communication between the high schools and colleges. Undoubtedly there are other, perhaps finer, differences, but those mentioned will serve to illustrate the fact that differences there are, and that an articulation problem does exist.

Cooperation Between High Schools and Colleges In The Articulation Process

It would seem advisable for secondary schools and colleges to work together toward the goal of reducing existing differences and easing the articulation process for students for whom each is concerned. In his 1926 study of freshman orientation, Doermann predicted that, "The problem here presented will eventually be attacked

jointly by the secondary school and the college. Each will find it necessary to move somewhat in the direction of the other." The 1938 Research Bulletin of the National Education Association strongly recommended such cooperation.

Recently some cooperation between high school and college personnel in assisting students with the transition from high school to college has been reported. Goodrich and Pierson (1959) found that the inclusion of high school counselors in the Michigan State University pre-college clinic not only fostered good public relations but also:

> ... facilitated the articulation between high school and the university by increasing the awareness of both high school and the university staff members of problems specific to the particular educational setting of the other, and by encouraging the exchange of ideas on common problems.

Seymour and Fain (1962) also reported on the use of high school counselors in the summer clinic for freshmen at the University of Alabama. Spolyar (1963) has suggested, as another possible way to improve relationships with high school counselors, that they be invited to participate for sizable periods of time in advising students in the university or college.

In 1961 Gow reported on an ambitious project to facilitate articulation from high school to college, the Educational Coordination Project of the Upper Ohio Valley Region. The goal of this project which brings together a large number of teachers, counselors, and administrators from schools, colleges, and universities, is to maintain "... continuing, dynamic inter-relationships among educational institutions at several levels, so that articulation, like education itself, becomes a viable, continuous process."

The problem of articulation from secondary to higher education continues to exist. Dissatisfaction on the part of higher education with the preparation of high school graduates, lack of common purposes, and too little communication and cooperation are cited as aspects of the problem. There are hopeful signs of partial resolution in reports of cooperative efforts on the parts of secondary school counselors and college administrative personnel.

An Evolving Philosophy of Orientation*

In its earlier years freshman orientation seems to have been carried out in the absence of a conceptual framework. It appears that the orientation movement arose to meet certain immediate needs of freshmen and institutions. Recently, however, the relevance of traditional orientation procedures to the present academic situation has been questioned. Out of this questioning a philosophy of orientation is evolving. In this section consideration will be given to the potential of freshman orientation, the past and present ideas of orientation, and to recent attempts to implement the emerging concept of orientation.

The Potential of Orientation

William G. Cole (Brown, 1961) made several cogent statements regarding the potentials of an orientation program. Said he, "... the whole orientation program is exceedingly important because it sets the tone, establishes a level of expectancy, and lets the freshman know at once what it means to be a student at this institution." He went on to point out that while the orientation program could only be a small step in the direction of introducing

---

*In this section of the review "orientation" will be largely synonymous with "Freshman Week."

students to the intellectual aspirations of an institution, it should certainly be a step in the right direction. He expressed concern over what the initial image of institutions were from the emphases of their orientation programs.

Shaffer (1962) examined orientation procedures in the light of communications research. He suggested that orientation directors should endeavor to remove from the tools of their trade anything which would give a false interpretation of the college experience. He asked a pointed question:

> What kind of image of himself as a student and the school as an educational institution does the typical student have after being tested, programmed, mixed, introduced, inspired, registered and enrolled by means of the traditional orientation process?

Freedman (1960) suggested that if the orientation program were properly carried out, it could both inform the students of the goals of the college and enhance the students' understanding of their own goals.

Orientation, then, is potentially a means of communicating to students the essential goals of the college experience and of enhancing the students' clarification of their own goals. It can be a first step in the right direction toward successful academic involvement. It has potential for good when properly conceived and carried out, but a proper conception of orientation <u>is</u> essential for the realization of its potential.

<u>The Conception of Orientation: 1926 to 1950</u>

Prior to the 1950's, at the earliest, orientation does not appear to have been based upon well thought out principles. Essentially, the literature of the period (1926-1950) is more concerned with listing activities and immediate goals for orientation

than with delineating underlying principles upon which the practices were based.

In 1926, Doermann stated, with regard to Freshman Week in particular, "The emphasis throughout this period should be upon the immediate problems which freshmen are facing ...." He did add to this that no opportunity should be lost to relate orientation activities to larger goals of the institution, but did not specify these goals. He outlined a model Freshman Week program which reflected his concern for immediate problems such as inadequacy of study skills and the need for information, testing, and socializing. Doermann certainly had an idea, if not a philosophy, of what this phase of freshman orientation ought to be.

Lloyd-Jones (1928) listed nine immediate goals of freshman orientation ranging from establishing freshmen in suitable living quarters, through becoming acquainted with some faculty members, upperclassmen, and fellow freshmen, to pleasantly entertaining them throughout the period. Each goal she listed was one that could be immediately reached and would involve nothing beyond the orientation week itself.

In 1930 Knode outlined five factors which necessitated orientation programs: (1) enlarged enrollments; (2) heterogeneity of freshman social background; (3) increasing complexity of instructional field; (4) growing independence of secondary school curricula from college domination; and (5) conflict and confusion over educational objectives. He further listed ten objectives for an effective orientation program. Each of the objectives was either informational, social, or registration procedural in nature. If we can make inferences from this list of necessary reasons for

orientation, we might infer that freshman orientation grew more from needs than from ideas.

The 1938 Research Bulletin of the National Education Association listed fourteen objectives for the orientation week. The details of the list differed to a limited extent from previous listings, but the emphasis upon assisting freshmen with immediate problems remained the same. The Bulletin, however, did raise the issue of a conceptual framework for orientation. It stated, that, "Properly conceived, [underlining added] it is a useful device in guidance but its purposes should be clearly defined, its activities carefully planned, its limitations fully recognized." It further suggested that Freshman Week "... should not be regarded as an adequate means for inducting the student into the atmosphere and life of the college." It appears that this bulletin was the first tc raise the issue of clarifying conceptions and purposes of Freshman Week. This also appears to be the first critical note sounded regarding this orientation technique.

Bookman's study (1948) was another of the descriptive type which listed orientation practices and procedures. It made no mention of conceptual undergirdings for orientation practices.

The literature on orientation prior to 1950 was essentially activity-centered and descriptive. Very little criticism of orientation was heard. In fact as late as 1959 this set persisted in the literature. At this time Powell (Hardee, 1959) writing in a tradition characteristic of the period being discussed, presented a list of informational, social, and procedural objectives of 125 orientation programs and concluded by stating that the 1923 University of Maine's Freshman Week schedule was an adequate frame-

work for planning current orientation programs. Others, however, did not share Powell's view and began to question the adequacy of traditional practices to orient freshmen to the contemporary academic world.

An Evolving Philosophy of Orientation Since 1950

In actual fact the philosophy of orientation which has been evolving in recent years has been expressed consistently and extensively only since 1960. However, a few voices suggesting the new idea were heard in the 1950's. In essence the philosophy of orientation to be discussed in this section would make of it an induction into, or at least consistent with, college intellectual life rather than merely an attempt to meet immediate freshman and institutional needs.

In 1951 Croft suggested that with regard to orientation shift from the "how to" and "what" to the "why" of orientation was in order. However, he did not offer any new reason for orientation but simply repeated the reasons for its origin and two previously recognized and stated objectives for the activities. That same year Guthrie (1951) suggested several improvements which were needed in freshman orientation at Ohio State University. Among these was the need to restate aims and review all projects to meet those aims. He further suggested four aims or purposes for orientation: (1) orientation to the university and its purposes, to establish loyalty to it; (2) orientation to academic life; (3) orientation to extra-curricular and to social life; (4) orientation to life aims and purposes. This appears to be the first specific mention made in the literature of orienting students to academic life. And such goals as orienting students to the university and its purposes or

orienting students to life aims and purposes are far removed from the previous emphasis upon immediate adjustment problems.

Greer (Lloyd-Jones, 1954) began early to criticize orientation practices. He pointed out that over the ensuing years there had been little change in the techniques reported by Bookman (1948) and Doermann (1926). He suggested that critical evaluation of orientation practices was long overdue, and that programs ought to operate "... within a general framework of educational philosophy conducive to the total learning of the whole student."

In the past six years commentary on the philosophical basis for freshman orientation has been rather extensive. The 1960 American Council on Education conference proceedings (Brown,1961) dealt at length with the problem of orienting freshmen to college intellectual life. It was assumed by this gathering that the purpose of orientation was to induct students into the community of learning. Freedman (1960) asked the question of what colleges can do, particularly in their orientation procedures, to promote the ends of liberal education. Obviously he was concerned that orientation be conceived of in terms of a larger philosophy of education.

Shaffer (1962) stated that, "The major purpose [underlining added] of orientation to higher education is to communicate to the new student a concept of college as a self-directed, intellectually oriented experience." He further stated:

> ... it is incumbent upon educational administrators to review their approach to orientation in order to make certain that the major emphasis they are trying to communicate is unmistakably clear amid all the procedural and socially pleasant exercise.

He concluded, as might be expected, that the program ought to be affected by the purpose for which it was designed.

In 1963 Greer levelled questions and criticisms at virtually every orientation procedure, suggested needed revisions and, in some cases, suggested the exclusion of practices. He stated:

> We must conscientiously think about what we are trying to do in orientation today. Are we following a traditional pattern established under an old philosophy of education, or are we adapting programs to the realities of modern higher education? Our new student is sophisticated in every way; he knows that much more is expected of him intellectually, that there are no more "country club" colleges, and he wants to know how to meet these expectations. If we expect to orient him according to his needs, this fact must be recognized.

He went on to say that, "The trend [in orientation] at all levels today is toward a more academic or intellectual approach and somewhat less on life adjustment."

Fitzgerald (1963) found two basic philosophical theses implemented in orientation programs. The first, she labelled the "microcosmic" philosophy, which is reflected in an emphasis on placement testing, pre-registration advising, introductions, tours, informational meetings, and activities which, in general, seek to direct and assist the student in his immediate relationship to the institution. The second, she labelled the "macrocosmic" philosophy, which is reflected in an emphasis upon intellectual challenge and development, "great books," "issues" discussions, and activities which, in general, seek to place the student within theuniversity in terms of the functions and goals of higher education.

While Fitzgerald recognized the value of the "macrocosmic" approach she recommended that <u>both</u> approaches be used as each has weaknesses if used alone. Fitzgerald would have orientation be both an effort to deal with immediate problems (as is traditionally the case) and an introduction to intellectual life (a relatively

recent, and not widely practiced idea). She pointed out the limitations of the "microcosmic" approach thus:

> Instead of the desired introduction to the academic aspect of student life, individual responsibilities for sound study habits and academic programming, the student may become the victim of an introduction to the "social-educational" program geared away from the academic life of the campus.

In 1963 Spolyar reported on a study of thirteen university orientation programs. He found that, "what orientation should be and do was not defined ..." by these institutions. He further stated, "In no case should an orientation effort be permitted to give an impression of the university in contradiction to its dedication to learning ..." That is, a conceptual basis for orientation was found lacking, and there was danger that orientation was a false introduction to college life.

Spolyar (1964) also conducted a self-study on orientation at the University of Washington. He urged orientation directors to assume responsibility for investigating, understanding, and articulating the process of orientation. He expressed dismay at finding a pronounced "... imbalance between <u>procedural</u> and <u>social</u> orientation as opposed to <u>academic</u> orientation." Said he, "When the strong academic purpose of our (University of Washington's) objectives is recognized, and we assess the amount of effort expended in the past on social and procedural aspects of orientation, the disproportion becomes immediately apparent."

In recent years concern has been expressed over what sort of initial impression is made upon freshmen by traditional orientation programs. The question of how orientation to the academic purposes of institutions can be accomplished has been raised. Commentators have been concerned about the disparity between institutional aims

and the impact of the activities which constitute the initial introduction to the institutions. A philosophy of orientation that would have its primary purpose and emphasis to be the introduction of students to the intellectual aims of the college experience is evolving at the present time.

Implementing an Intellectual Philosophy of Orientation

Although the philosophy of orientation described in this paper is still in an emerging state, there have been efforts made to implement it in actual orientation programs. Within the last seven years several such attempts have been reported.

Perkins, Zeigler and Smith (1959) reported on the use of a series of "Faculty Talks" to stimulate students' intellects during orientation week at Pennsylvania State University. Approximately 12 per cent of the freshmen attended one or more of the lectures. The attendants obtained significantly higher GPA's at the end of the first semester and had a significantly higher mean on the University Aptitude Examination than the non-attendants; no cause-effect relationship was implied. Ninety-five per cent of the attendants and 68 per cent of the non-attendants recommended that the "Faculty Talks" should be retained as part of the orientation program. Fifty-seven per cent of the non-attendants reported that conflicts in scheduling prohibited their attendance, and 80 per cent of this group of non-attendants stated that they would have attended the lectures had it not been for the conflicts. In general the "Faculty Talks" were favorably perceived and had definite appeal to at least some entering freshmen.

Cole (Brown, 1961) reported on an orientation program at Williams College in which an attempt was made to "... place the whole emphasis of the ... program on the intellectual life and

welcome freshmen at once to the house of intellect." Freshmen were sent five books during the summer, and during orientation they attended a series of four panel discussions on the books. Each panel was composed of two faculty members and two Phi Beta Kappa students. After each panel discussion, freshmen continued discussion with faculty advisers and selected upper classmen in the dormitories. Cole reported that, as a result of the program, faculty advisers got to know their advisees far better than they would have in an entire semester otherwise, the general level of conversation among freshmen was raised from a trivial to a substantial level, and the students given real prestige were not the social or athletic leaders, but the students with ideas and ability to communicate them. In general, he reported, the level of expectancy regarding college work was raised for the entire class.

Tautfest (1961) reported on a survey of expectations for orientation made of prospective freshmen at Purdue University. Her findings indicated that freshmen were much concerned about academic responsibilities. She stated that, "as a result of the findings of this study, increased emphasis on the academic and intellectual areas of college life was incorporated into the program for the following fall."

In 1962, Fley stated that the first purpose of the orientation program at the University of Illinois was, "to establish among new students an intellectual rather than a social approach to their college experience." To implement this purpose a summer reading list (relevant to the freshman rhetoric course) was combined with a series of televised "Student-Faculty Forums." The "Forums" were followed immediately by living unit discussion groups led by upper classmen. With regard to the summer reading list she said:

> The program was designed to create a climate of opinion and seriousness of academic purpose on the part of the incoming freshmen, to break down expectations that college was a social fling, and to provide a lead-in to the Student-Faculty Forum television program ...

She found that television was an effective means of presenting key people in the university to freshmen. The program was generally successful; 98 per cent of the freshmen participated in one of the "Forums."

Shaffer (1962) expressed the opinion "that preliminary contacts with the university, pre-college programs, and Freshman Week all fail to impress the incoming student with the academic nature of the college community. He reported that Indiana University, in an attempt to dispel the negative effects of a slow beginning in intellectual endeavor, gives freshmen assignments during enrollment, which are due the first class period.

Fitzgerald (1963) suggested that faculty be vitally involved in freshman orientation as a means of increasing intellectual stimulation during the process. She wrote, "The framework for an enriched educational experience and the foundation for scholarship can be introduced during the initial stages of the student-collegiate relationship by means of active faculty support and participation in new student orientation programs." Spolyar (1963) also cited the "crucial" role of the faculty in creating an intellectual atmosphere during freshman orientation.

Ivey (1963) reported on a three year evaluation of Freshman Week at Bucknell University. He found that, despite a significant increase in academic ability of the students in the third year over those of the previous two years of the study and a deliberate effort to increase the intellectual content of orientation during the third year of the study, students responded best to social and

informational activities during the entire period of the study. He suggested the possibility that orientation week was an inadequate vehicle for shaping freshmen attitudes in a direction different from that prevalent among students on campus.

In 1965, Zwicky suggested that Ivey's study was outdated, and reported that the University of Houston had been successful in its intellectual orientation program. It should be noted that her study lacked the rigor of Ivey's, but, nevertheless, she reported that, "The students responded most favorably to our desire to show them the cultural and intellectual life of the university, not just the social life." Students listed small-group discussions and faculty-led discussions, in that order, as the most important parts of the orientation program. She attributed the success of the program to the instruction of the faculty involved, the training of the upperclass counselors, the short length of the program, the changing character of entering students, and the choice of the assigned readings. Volkwein and Searles (1956) similarly found that the two events (of eighteen) in a three day orientation program at Harpur College, which received the highest percentages of "excellent" ratings by freshmen were lectures by faculty members.

Hyde (1966) expressed skepticism about the ability of the traditional orientation program to introduce students to the nature and purposes of higher education. He suggested, however, that a well-conceived, carefully planned summer reading program could be a means of introducing freshmen to intellectual life, providing the book(s) selected could be read, understood, appreciated, and discussed by freshmen. He noted that the purpose of a summer reading program ought to be to introduce students to an intellectual ideal, not the subject of a book <u>per se</u>.

Reports on attempts to introduce freshmen to college intellectual life during orientation are generally favorable and optimistic. A variety of methods to attain this goal have been tried. It should be noted, however, that these reports are limited in number and scope. Few of them are based upon the findings of sophisticated research. But, it is apparent that the emerging philosophy is receiving attention, and, as further results of efforts to implement it are reported, we may reasonably expect to find it embodied in a large number of orientation programs in coming years.

Pressures Militating Against Successful Intellectual Orientation

The idea and the attempts at introducing freshmen to college intellectual life by means of orientation appear sound in principle, but certain pressures militating against the realization of the ideal must be recognized. The pressures usually cited are the influence of the anti-intellectualistic upperclass subculture on campus and, behind that, the anti-intellectualistic tendencies of the American culture. A few examples will serve to illustrate this point.

With regard to the student culture's influence, Farnsworth (1957) noted, "Among the strongest forces acting on the new student as he enters college are the traditions of the older students handed down ... from one college generation to another." Freedman (1960) wrote similarly, "Suffice it to say now that in our opinion the scholastic and academic aims and processes of the college are in large measure transmitted to incoming students or mediated for them by the predominant student culture."

In Orientation to College Learning (Brown, 1961) many of the

contributors commented upon anti-intellectual pressures in the student culture. Sayvitz (Brown, 1961) stated:

> What are the essential factors involved in successfully introducing the students to the intellectual life of the college? One factor is that there be an intellectual life in evidence, one in which students already on campus are actively and obviously engaged. For it is students, I think, who transmit to one another in an immediate way ... the facts of academic life. If there are discrepancies between the high-sounding speeches of orientation and the attitudes and standards that actually prevail, the truth will out.

Stern (Brown, 1961) studied differences between freshmen and seniors at an unnamed institution. He found that freshmen held higher academic expectations for the institution than seniors indicated was characteristic of it. He concluded, "The students come expecting to learn; they learn not to expect so much. These data suggest that student apathy is the consequence of unfulfilled expectations in transition from high school to college rather than the cause."

Sanford (Brown, 1961) related the problem to both the student culture and the larger American culture. Said he:

> ... the major forces that oppose us when we try to initiate the freshmen into the intellectual life are the student peer culture which makes relatively few or no intellectual demands, and an adult culture, which accents grades or the practical aspects of college experience.

Havemann (Brown, 1961) emphasized the role of American culture in general. He stated, "Your beginning freshmen ... come to you ... from a home and from a social background where the role of the intellect has been minimized." He further stated, "I hope to impress upon you what a difficult job you undertake when you try to introduce the new college student ... to intellectuality. You are trying to move against our society's main stream of traffic."

Thus, perhaps, the ideal of orienting incoming students to collegiate intellectual life will long await fulfillment. Certainly such an orientation will be no easy task. What is needed is research to determine whether, in fact, it can be effectively accomplished. There is some evidence that it is possible despite the opposing forces. It seems appropriate at this time to study the extent to which the emerging philosophy has affected orientation practices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bester, A. E. Educational wastelands. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

Brown, N. C. (Ed.) Orientation to college learning. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1961.

Brubacher, J. S. & Rudy, W. Higher education in transition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Cass, J. & Birnbaum, M. Comparative guide to American colleges. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Doermann, H. J. The orientation of college freshmen. Baltimore: Williams and Williams Co., 1926.

Farnsworth, D. Mental health in college and university. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1957.

Hardee, M. D. The faculty in college counseling. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

Havinghurst, R. J. American higher education in the 1960's. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960.

Hoffman, R. & Plutchik, R. Small-groups in orientation and teaching. New York: G. P. Putnam's, 1959.

Jacob, P. E. Changing values in college. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Knode, J. C. Orienting the student to college with special reference to freshman week. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1930.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther. Student Personnel work. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther & Smith, Margaret R. (Eds.), Student personnel work as deeper teaching. New York: Harper, 1954.

Mueller, Kate H. Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1961.

Miller, J. C. The induction and adaptation of college freshmen. The University of Missouri Bulletin, 1930.

Seashore, C. E. Learning and living in college. Iowa City: Univ. of Iowa Press, 1927.

Wrenn, C. G. Student personnel work in college. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Periodicals

Ausk, Margaret. Freshman camp - a preparation and an education. Coll. and Univers., 1954, 30, 196-199.

Ball, M. Introducing freshmen to scholarship. School and Society, 1923, 7, 205-208.

Berg, Dorothea. Bridging the gap between high school and college. J. of the Nat. Ass'n of Deans of Women, 1953, 17, 35-40.

Bookman, Gladys. Freshman orientation techniques in colleges and universities. Occupations, 1948, 27, 163-166.

Bowles, F. Our changing colleges. Nat. Ass'n of Women Deans and Counselors J., 1959, 23, 158-165.

Bradley, P., Strang, Ruth & Wood, A. Orientation of students. J. of Nat. Ass'n. of Deans of Women, 1945, 8, 106-108.

Caldwell, E. Stability of cores on a personality inventory during college orientation week. Personnel and Guid. J., 1959, 38, 305-308.

Croft, L. W. Orientation week philosophy and purposes. Educ. Psychol. Measmt., 1951, 11, 711-714.

Crow, L. D. College orientation: a basic responsibility of the high school. Clearing House, 1962, 36, 301-304.

Fahrbach, C. G., Jr. A university looks at its pre-college and fall orientation programs. Coll. and Univers., 1960, 35, 166-170.

Fitzgerald, Laurine E. & Busch, Shirley A. Orientation programs: foundations and framework. Coll.and Univers., 1963, 38, 270-275.

Fley, Jo Ann. Two innovations in freshman orientation: the use of educational television and summer programs. J. of the Nat. Ass'n. of Women Deans and Counselors, 1962, 25, 181-188.

Forrest, D. V. & Knapp, R. H. Summer college orientation programs. J. Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1966, 7, 47-49.

Freedman, M. B. Some observations of students as they relate to orientation procedures in colleges and universities. J. Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1960, 2, 2-10.

From high school to college. Research Bulletin of the National Ed. Ass'n., 1938, 16, 66-87.

Goodrich, T. A. Gains in self-understanding through a pre-college clinic. Personnel Guid. J., 1953, 31, 433-438.

Goodrich, T. A. & Pierson, R. R. Pre-college counseling at Michigan State University. Personnel Guid. J., 1959, 37, 595-597.

Gow, J. S. Articulation between secondary schools and colleges: the educational coordination project of the upper Ohio valley region. Nat. Ass'n. of Women Deans and Counselors J., 1961, 24, 11-15.

Greene, G. H. Freshman orientation courses in small colleges. Personnel Guid. J., 1954, 32, 480-482.

Guthrie, W. S. Orientation week results obtained and/or improvements needed. Educ. Psychol. Measmt., 1951, 11, 715-717.

Heist, P. Implications from recent research on college students. Nat. Ass'n. of Women Deans and Counselors J., 1959, 22, 116-124.

House, J. G., The University of Colorado summer orientation program: its functions and philosophy. Coll. and Univers., 1960, 35, 177-180.

Ivey, A. E. A three year evaluation of a college freshman week program. J. of Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1963, 5, 113-118.

Jones, A. L. Personnel techniques and freshman guidance. Bulletin of the Ass'n. of Amer. Colls., 1928, 91-104.

Karm, R. B. Personalizing the college experience. School and Society, 1950, 72, 263-265.

Lee, M. A. & Froe, V. D. New emphasis in freshman orientation. Personnel Guid. J., 1956, 34, 360-365.

Little, C. C. Discussion of freshman week. School and Society, 1950, 72, 263-265.

Lloyd, Betty J. A questionnaire portrait of the freshman coed: early adjustment. Nat. Ass'n. of Women Deans and Counselors J., 1965, 28, 160-166.

Ludeman, W. W. Trends in college freshman orientation. Educ. Forum, 1956, 21, 63-65.

McCracken, C. W. Student personnel work and the climate for learning. Personnel Guid. J., 1964, 42, 904-907.

McCracken, C. W., Wharton, W. P. & Graff, G. The pre-college clinic week. Personnel Guid. J., 1956, 34, 437-440.

McFee, Ann. The relation of student's needs to their perceptions of college environment. J. Educ. Psychol., 1961, 52, 25-29.

Mehl, W. J. Developing a college orientation program. Coll. and Univers., 1955, 30, 53-61.

Moser, L. Analyzing some of the transitory fears of entering college freshmen. Coll. and Univers., 1955, 30, 282-283.

Newton, D. Dear parents: our college cordially invites you. Personnel Guid. J., 1955, 33, 217-218.

Parker, I. W. Orientation week problems and procedures in administration. Educ. Psychol. Measmt., 1951, 11, 718-721.

Plutchik, R. & Hoffman, R. W. The small-group orientation program. J. of Higher Educ., 1958, 29, 278-279.

Raines, M. R. Helping college freshmen identify problems through a case conference. Personnel and Guid. J., 1956, 34, 417-419.

Reiter, H. H. The effect of orientation through small-group discussion on modification of certain attitudes. J. of Educ. Research, 1964, 58, 65-68.

Robertson, J. H. Results of a pre-college testing and counseling program. Personnel and Guid. J., 1959, 37, 451-455.

Seymour, J. C. & Fain, G. A summer program combining freshman orientation, counseling, and counselor preparation. Personnel and Guid. J., 1962, 40, 477-479.

Shaffer, R. H. A new look at orientation. Coll. and Univers., 1962, 37, 272-279.

Smith, Bernard M. Small group meetings of college freshmen and frequency of withdrawals. J. of Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1963, 4, 165-170.

Smith, Paul M. Some implications of freshman orientation activities with Negro college students. J. of Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1964, 5, 176-179, 184.

Stamatakos, L. C. An orientation week reception -vehicle for improved public relations. J. of Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1963, 5, 32-34.

Stoddard, G. D. & Freden, G. The status of freshman week in large universities. School and Society, 1926, 24, 568-589.

Tautfest, Patricia B. An evaluation technique for orientation programs. J. Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1961, 3, 25-28, 32.

Volkwein, J. F. & Searles, A. Evaluation of a three-day new student orientation. J. Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1965, 6, 293-294.

Wall, H. W. A counseling program for parents of college freshmen. Personnel and Guid. J., 1962, 40, 774-778.

Warnath, C. F. & Fordyce, H. R. Inventoried values of entering college freshmen. Personnel and Guid. J., 1961, 40, 277-281.

Wilson, E. S. The Orientation of college freshmen. Coll. and Univers., 1955, 30, 483-489.

Zwicky, Laurie. A successful intellectual orientation program. J. of Coll. Stud. Personnel, 1965, 6, 200-202.

Unpublished Material

Black, B. R. Student needs and orientation director's aspirations. Paper read at Sixteenth Annual Orientation Directors Conference, Bloomington, Indiana, 1963.

Cole, C. W. & Ivey, A. E. Differences between students attending and not attending a pre-college orientation. Unpublished paper, Colorado State University, no date.

Crookston, B. Evaluating the pre-school orientation program. Unpublished paper, Univer. of Utah, no date.

Davison, H. M. Problems and potentials in orientation evaluation. Paper read at Seventeenth Annual Orientation Directors Conference, State College, Pennsylvania, 1964.

Greer, D. J. Orientation - tradition or reality? Paper read at Sixteenth Annual Orientation Directors Conference, Bloomington, Indiana, 1963.

Hyde, J. M. Why a summer reading program? Paper read at the APGA panel on "New Dimensions in Orientation," Washington, D. C., 1966.

Ivey, A. E. & Miller, C. D. A study of student reaction to welcome week September, 1963. Unpublished Paper, Colorado State University, 1964.

Kimball, Roma N. A study of thirty university orientation programs with suggestions for a new orientation system at Florida State University. Unpublished paper, Florida State Univ., 1965.

Kronovet, Esther. Current Practices in freshman orientation throughout the United States. Paper read at ACPA meeting, Washington, D. C., 1966.

Lloyd-Jones, Esther. A deeper look at orientation. Paper read at Seventeenth Annual Orientation Directors Conference, State College, Pennsylvania, 1964.

Marks, E., Perkins, H. W. & Zeigler, M. L. Student reaction to orientation week. Unpublished paper, Pennsylvania State Univ., 1958.

Miller, C. D. & Ivey, A. E. Student attitudes to three types of orientation programs. Paper read at the APGA panel on "New Dimensions in Orientation," Washington, D. C., 1966.

Perkins, H. W., Zeigler, M. L. & Smith, J. A. A means of stimulating students' intellect during a university orientation week. Paper read at Pennsylvania Speech Annual, State College, Pennsylvania, 1959.

Smith, J. A., Perkins, H. W. & Zeigler, M. L. An analysis of student reaction to the faculty talks offered during orientation week in the fall of 1957. Unpublished paper, Pennsylvania State Univ., 1958.

Spolyar, L. J. Summary of Orientation programs as reported by thirteen selected universities. Unpublished report to Ad-Hoc Committee to Study Orientation and Registration at the University of Washington, 1963.

Spolyar, L. J. A self-study report on orientation. Paper read at the Seventeenth Annual Orientation Directors Conference, State College, Pennsylvania, 1964.

Wall, H. W. A follow-up report on Penn State's counseling for parents of college students. Paper read at the APGA convention, Minneapolis, 1965.

Wall, H. W. & Ford, D. H. Penn State's pre-registration counseling program. Paper read at the APGA panel on "New Dimensions in Orientation," Washington, D. C., 1966.